



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,253	09/22/2003	Hidejiro Maehara	242936US2	9515
22850	7590	08/09/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			FRANKLIN, RICHARD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,253	MAEHARA, HIDEJIROU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard Franklin	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/09/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 14 have been examined.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 340 (Page 33 line 13). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "330" has been used to designate both "message box" and "location data" (Fig 8). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet; even if only one figure is being amended. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: S104 (Fig 5), 108 (Fig 10), and 123 (Fig 10). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 7 – 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okada et al. US Patent No. 6,088,125.
 - a. As per Claims 1, 13, and 14, Okada et al. teach an image printing apparatus in the form of a facsimile machine. The apparatus contains a storage area for storing a table of printing results and addresses associated with them (Col 16 lines 18 – 27, Fig 19). The system also includes an area that detects the printing result and determines if it is in the table that stores the printing results (Col 16 lines 28 – 50, Fig 22). After the result is determined, the apparatus determines the address to send a notification to if necessary (Col 16 lines 28 – 50, Fig 22). Then, a notification of the result is sent to the address or addresses that were selected (Col 16 lines 51 – 56).
 - b. As per Claim 7, Okada et al. teach the apparatus as described per Claim 1. Okada et al. also teach that the table that stores the addresses to send notifications to holds more than one address for an individual printing result (Col 16 lines 51 – 56).
 - c. As per Claim 8, Okada et al. teach the apparatus as described per Claim 7. Okada et al. also teach that the addresses that the notification is sent to are that of the user or a system administrator (Col 16 lines 51 – 56).
 - d. As per Claim 9, Okada et al. teach the apparatus as described per Claim 1. Okada et al. also teach that the addresses that the notification is sent to are e-

mail addresses (Col 16 lines 15 – 56). These addresses are stored in association with the printing results (Col 16 lines 18 – 27, Fig 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. US Patent No. 6,088,125 in view of Microsoft Corporation, Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition.

Okada et al. teach a printing apparatus as described per Claim 1 in the form of a facsimile machine.

Okada et al. do not teach that the printing apparatus includes a scanning process for optically recording an image.

Microsoft Corporation defines a “multifunction peripheral” as a device that combines printing with faxing, scanning, and copying in a single unit (“Multifunction Peripheral”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the scanning and copying process of Microsoft Corporation in the printing apparatus of Okada et al. Microsoft Corporation discloses that this integrating

of processes is popular in the small office and home office market because of cost-effectiveness and space limitation considerations ("Multifunction Peripheral").

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. US Patent No. 6,088,125 in view of Microsoft Corporation, Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition and in further view of Sorens et al. US Patent No. 6,317,848 B1.

Okada – Microsoft teach a printing apparatus that is a printer that is capable of incorporating a number functions as described per Claim 2 above. The functions include a reading function that can read a document or image through an optical device, and writing a document or image to a physical medium such as paper.

Okada – Microsoft do not teach that the reading and writing functions each include a process management unit that monitors and detects problems occurring in connection with the operations.

Sorens et al. teach a printer failure tracking system that includes a unit that detects the occurrence of an error condition in the printer (Sorens; Col 2 lines 10 – 19, Fig 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the error detection unit in the system of Sorens et al. in the printing apparatus of Okada – Microsoft. Including an error-detecting unit in the system of Okada – Microsoft allows for ease and of use and servicing.

8. Claim 4 – 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. US Patent No. 6,088,125 in view of Sorens et al. US Patent No. 6,317,848 B1.

Okada et al. teach a printing apparatus as described per Claim 1 in the form of a facsimile machine.

Okada et al. do not teach that the printing apparatus transmits usage information along with the print results that are sent to an address.

Sorens et al. teach a system for communicating printer failures and errors where the communication messages include usage information about the printer (Sorens; Col 6 lines 6 – 9). The usage information includes an ID number of the printer (Sorens; Col 4 lines 18 – 29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the usage information of Sorens et al. in the printing apparatus of Okada et al. Including the location of the printer in the usage information would have also been obvious because in a networked environment, it is essential to know where a piece of hardware is located in the event that service is needed. Including the usage information in with the message allows the user receiving the message to prevent or predict future service problems (Sorens; Col 1 lines 21 – 33).

9. Claims 10 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. US Patent No. 6,088,125 in view of Parry US Patent No. 6,666,594 B2.

Okada et al. teach a printing apparatus as described per Claim 9 in the form of a facsimile machine.

Okada et al. do not teach that the printing apparatus included a web page creating means that creates a web page that includes detailed information about the printing result.

Parry teaches a printer system that assigns errors or groups of errors an error code to identify the error (Parry; Col 7 lines 31 – 45). Parry also teaches that the printer system includes a web server that is capable of conveying information upon request for information about a printing error (Parry; Claim 22). Parry also teaches that a link to the web page is included in an email message sent to the network administrator or other user (Col 8 lines 9 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the web server of Parry in the printing apparatus of Okada. Including the web server in the system of Okada would allow for users to obtain information about an error when they need it. Including the error codes with the errors allows for the errors to be identified and distinguished from other errors. Including a link to the web page in an email message would allow the user to gain quick information about the error.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Franklin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0669. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard Franklin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2182

Tammara Peyton
TAMMARA PEYTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER